

V. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kunagai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,250,600) in view of Umemura et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0098091). Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Taguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,572) in view of Umemura. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Concerning claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the present application, cited patent 600, cited patent 091, and cited patent 572 are provided.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the aforementioned cited patents do not describe structure (a) "an edge of the one end portion of the valve rod is roundly or hemispherically shaped, and wherein the fitting recessed portion is formed such that the patch member can be tilted with respect to the valve rod", a recited feature of the invention according to claim 1 of the present application.

The cited patents are cited for the aforementioned reason for rejection. Cited patent 600 describes a structure wherein a ball 77 is disposed at the bottom of the one end portion of a valve rod 65, and the ball 77 is placed in a spherical recess 7.

This structure differs from the aforementioned structure (a) of the invention of the present application recited immediately above. In addition, the number of components and the number of assembly processes of the invention described in cited patent 600 are larger than those of the present invention. Thus, the two inventions are different also in terms of effects.

Moreover, cited patents 091 and 572 do not describe the aforementioned structure (a) of the invention of the present application either.

It is respectfully submitted that that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 as discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art could not combine the features of the applied art to arrive at the claimed invention because the applied art is devoid of all the features of the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same,

TOC-0007
(80402-0007)


Application No. 10/689,699

the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2008

By:



Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal

DC306927.DOC